

REMARKS

In the final Office Action mailed August 4, 2004, the Examiner stated that the seat as claimed in claim 15 is not limited to the amusement park area, because the preamble of claim 15, lines 1 and 2, is not limiting to the same.

Applicant has now amended claim 15, accordingly, limiting the claimed seat to a passenger seat for an amusement park installation.

Applicant submits that the claimed seat, as now amended, belongs to a specific field that is fully distinguishable from and is far afield from seats used in the medical device area.

Thus, for the reasons already set forth in Applicant's remarks filed on April 27, 2004, Applicant submits that the seat as claimed in amended claim 15 is now clearly patentably distinguishable from the seats of the medical area disclosed by Walsh, Walton and Alfred.

Claim 16 and 17 depend upon claim 15, and therefore are deemed to be patentable, too. In addition, claim 16 recites lateral parts projecting below the base of the seat, for the lateral holding of the passenger's legs, that cooperate with the flaps for locking the legs of the passenger. None of the cited medical device references discloses or suggests this feature.

In the final Office Action mailed August 4, 2004, claims 18-20 and 22-29 have been objected as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but the Examiner stated that they would be considered allowable if re-written in independent form, including all the limitations of the base claim and the intervening claims. Applicant has re-written claim 18 in independent form, incorporating all the limitations of claims 17 and 15.

Applicant has also re-written claim 20 in independent form, incorporating all the limitations of claims 17 and 15.


A scrivener's error in claim 29 has been corrected, too.

Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 18 and 20 are now allowable as they have been amended in the manner suggested by the Examiner that would make them so. Applicant submits that dependent claims 19 and 22-29 that depend from claims 18 and 20 are therefore patentable, too.

Applicant submits that dependent claim 21, depending now upon allowable claim 20, is therefore also allowable.

In view of the above, it is believed that the claimed invention, as defined by the amended claims, is clearly now patentably distinguishable over the prior art made of record, and entry of these amendments under Rule 116 and favorable reconsideration and allowance of all pending claims are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By: 
Clifford W. Browning
Reg. No. 32,201
Woodard, Emhardt et al. LLP
Bank One Center/Tower
111 Monument Circle, Suite 3700
Indianapolis, Indiana 46204-5137
(317) 634-3456

#301294